



# United States Department of the Interior



**FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**  
National Wildlife Refuge System  
Branch of Air Quality  
7333 W. Jefferson Ave., Suite 375  
Lakewood, CO 80235-2017

IN REPLY REFER TO:

FWS/ANWS-AR-AQ

November 30, 2011

Ms. Tessa Stevens  
Air Quality Division  
DEQ State Office  
1410 N. Hilton  
Boise, ID 83706-1255

Dear Ms. Stevens:

On October 19, 2011, the State of Idaho submitted a proposed Tier II permit for the Amalgamated Sugar Company, LLC – Nampa Factory (TASCO). Additionally, the State proposed analyses to revise Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) and BART alternative emission standards and requirements for the TASCO Riley Boiler and Nampa Factory in accordance with 40 CFR 51.308(e) and IDAPA 58.01.01.668. We appreciate the opportunity to work closely with the State on regional haze state implementation planning and the subsequent review of this proposal. Cooperative efforts such as these ensure that, together, we will continue to make progress toward the Clean Air Act's goal of natural visibility conditions at all of our most pristine National Parks and Wilderness Areas for future generations.

This letter acknowledges that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the National Park Service, has received and reviewed your proposal. In general, we support the revised BART determination which identifies specific controls to be applied to the Riley Boiler. However, we have several concerns regarding the applicability of the proposed BART alternative. Specifically, we question whether consideration of non-BART units, swapping pollutants, and crediting emission controls resulting from non-BART, Clean Air Act requirements are appropriate when developing a BART alternative plan. Please see the attached document for our complete comments.



Again, we appreciate the opportunity to work closely with you on this proposal. For further information, please contact Tim Allen at (303) 914-3802.

Sincerely,



Sandra V. Silva  
Chief, Branch of Air Quality

Enclosure

cc:

Steve Body  
Office of Air, Waste and Toxics  
U.S. EPA Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

John Segar, Chief Branch of Fire  
Management  
National Interagency Fire Center  
3833 South Development Ave.  
Boise, Idaho 83705

Judy Rocchio  
National Park Service  
Pacific West Regional Office  
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700  
Oakland, CA 94607

John Reber, Physical Scientist  
Physical Science Resource Program Lead  
Intermountain Regional Office  
National Park Service  
12795 W. Alameda Parkway  
Denver, CO 80225-0287

James A. Morris, Superintendent  
Craters of the Moon National Monument  
P.O. Box 29  
Arco, ID 83213

Patricia Brewer  
Regional Haze Program Lead  
Air Resources Division  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 25287  
Denver, Colorado 80225-0287

Rick Coleman, Regional Chief  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Mountain-Prairie Region  
134 Union Blvd.  
Lakewood, CO 80228

Bill West, Refuge Manager  
Red Rocks Lakes National Wildlife Refuge  
27650 B South Valley Road  
Lima, MT 59739

## **Comments of the US Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) Regarding an “Alternative-to-BART” Proposal to Meet Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) for The Amalgamated Sugar Company LLC (TASCO) Nampa Factory as Proposed by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ)**

The IDEQ determined that the Riley Boiler at the TASCO Nampa Factory is subject to BART under the EPA Guidelines for Best Available Retrofit Technology Determinations<sup>1</sup> and IDEQ provided an original BART determination on July 17, 2009. TASCO objected to the original BART determination and pursued an “Alternative-to-BART” in negotiations with the IDEQ. Subsequently, IDEQ provided to the FWS, “Proposed Revision to ‘Section 10.5 TASCO BART Determination’ of the RH SIP” (Proposed Revision), along with an Air Quality Permit Statement of Basis for the Tier II Operating Permit No. T2-2009.0105 Project 60867 and “BART Alternative Visibility Modeling for the Riley Boiler at TASCO – Nampa Factory” which propose an Alternative-to-BART under 40 CFR Part 51.308(e)(2). The FWS has several questions and comments relating to IDEQ’s proposed Alternative to BART determination for the TASCO Nampa Factory.

The FWS does not believe that IDEQ’s approach should or can be evaluated as an Alternative-to-BART; however, such a determination will ultimately be made by EPA, Region X. In a letter dated February 16, 2007, EPA, Region VIII communicated to the Colorado Air Pollution Control Division that regarding Public Service Company’s Hayden 1 and 2 and Comanche 1 and 2 facilities, use of an Alternative-to-BART approach within a source’s fence line may not be appropriate. The letter discusses that while EPA’s BART guidelines<sup>2</sup> contemplate that BART determinations may include averaging across BART emissions units within a source’s fence line, EPA does not characterize this as a BART alternative. Also, Section V of the BART guidelines discusses averaging emissions across any set of *BART-eligible emission units* within a fence line *for each pollutant*. The proposed Alternative-to-BART does not address each pollutant because there will be no control of SO<sub>2</sub> at the BART-eligible Riley boiler. Further, Section V seems to contemplate averaging across only BART-eligible emission units without including non-BART-eligible emission units. Since, 40 CFR Part 51.308(e)(2) is silent on the applicability of an Alternative-to-BART occurring within a fence line, it could be reasonably construed that Section V of the BART guidelines would govern such a situation.

This paragraph relates to the inclusion of emissions reduction credits from the permanent shutdown of three coal-fired pulp dryers as part of the Alternative-to-BART demonstration. For purposes of Best Available Control Technology (BACT) under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Program emission credits from the shutdown of emission units cannot be used as credit to meet BACT. We are not aware of any definitive language under the BART program that allows or disallows such shutdown

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Guidelines for BART Determinations Under the Regional Haze Rule.” 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix Y.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., Section V – first paragraph.

credits for purposes of meeting BART, so it remains an open question for EPA, Region X to address in the case of the TASC Alternative-to-BART proposal. In 40 CFR Part 51.308(e)(2)(iv) it is stated that, “. . . emission reductions resulting from the emissions trading program or other alternative measure will be surplus to those reductions resulting from measures adopted to meet requirements of the CAA as of the baseline date of the SIP.” Page 33 in Attachment #2 of the Proposed Revision states that, “. . . shut down of the coal-fired pulp dryers was required to support the PM10 NAAQS Maintenance Plan for Ada County . . .” This issue bears further scrutiny before the Alternative-to-BART proposal is approved.

The underlying requirement for use of an Alternative-to-BART rather than BART for the Riley boiler is that the Alternative achieves greater reasonable progress toward meeting the long term strategy for visibility protection. Table 10-13 in Attachment #1 of the Proposed Revision develops the greater reasonable progress justification for the Eagle Cap Wilderness area using Spray Dryer Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) for SO<sub>2</sub> control as the SO<sub>2</sub> BART control (line 2 on the table). In Table 6 of the Statement of Basis for the Tier II Operating Permit, IDEQ presents an 80% emission reduction capability of Spray Dryer FGD for SO<sub>2</sub> control (522.3 lb/hr benchmark emissions vs. 104.0 lb/hr controlled emissions). Spray Dryer FGD can routinely be assumed to attain 90% control efficiency. Some examples for plants using Lime Spray Dryer FGD technology on low sulfur coal are as follows: Newmont Nevada - 93.1%, LS Power – White Pine - 89.8%, LS Power – High Plains - 93.4%, Two Elk Expansion - 89.9%, Basin Electric – Dry Fork - 92.9%, and AES-Colorado - 90.7%. If a modeling input of 90% SO<sub>2</sub> control was used for the BART case instead of 80%, the outcome for greater reasonable progress for the Alternative method would be more muted and possibly not show greater reasonable progress. Since it seems that the 80% control assumption was used for the greater reasonable progress demonstration, then the BART control level was understated, leaving a lower hurdle to demonstrate greater reasonable progress. The modeling should be performed using a 90% control efficiency assumption for the BART case.

It should be noted that the FWS still considers the Spray Dryer FGD SO<sub>2</sub> control alternative to be viable for BART. The IDEQ agreed with a \$2,663 per ton of SO<sub>2</sub> control cost for this alternative, including the costs of non-air quality environmental impacts. This value could be decreased to \$2,367 if the control efficiency were presented as 90%, rather than 80% in the cost development. A control efficiency of 90% for Spray Dryer FGD is certainly attainable as shown above. Either of the above costs should be considered as being reasonable for BART. It was indicated that the EPA Control Cost Manual was used to develop the Spray Dryer FGD costs. This analysis should be available in the record for third-party reviewers.

The following paragraph is moot if IDEQ proceeds with the Alternative-to-BART. However, should the discussion ever revert back to using Spray Dryer FGD as BART for SO<sub>2</sub> control, cost justification in terms of cost per deciview of visibility improvement should use the concept presented below. The concept of cumulative visibility impact reductions at all seven affected Class I areas should be considered. Such considerations have been employed in BART determinations

by Alaska, Oregon and Wyoming. Earlier the IDEQ made judgments on cost per deciview based on only the most impacted Class I area, Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. We continue to believe that it is appropriate to consider both the degree of visibility improvement in a given Class I area as well as the cumulative effects of improving visibility across all of the Class I areas affected. It simply does not make sense to use the same metric to evaluate the effects of reducing emissions from a BART source that impacts only one Class I area as for a BART source that impacts multiple Class I areas. And, it does not make sense to evaluate impacts at one Class I area, while ignoring others that are similarly significantly impaired. If emissions from TASC0 are reduced, the benefits will be spread well beyond only the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area to the other six affected Class I areas.

In Section 5 of Proposed Revision - Attachment #3, "Redlined Version of the Revised BART Tier II Operating Permit", no SO<sub>2</sub> emission limits are provided for the Riley Boiler or the two Babcock and Wilcox Boilers. Even though under the proposed Alternative scenario they will not be controlled, there should be SO<sub>2</sub> emission limits for these units (e.g., 522 lb/hour for the Riley Boiler and 435 lb/hr for the two B&W boilers). Such emission limits could prevent a future TASC0 transition to a coal that has higher sulfur content than the current average being used (0.75% sulfur) up to the current state limit of 1.0% sulfur. In such a case actual visibility improvement would not likely meet the performance provided in the Alternative-to-BART. A similar situation could exist if the two B&W boilers undergo a BACT analysis for expansion in the future without considering the BART premises being instituted at this time.